

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-16 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-16 were rejected. With this Amendment, claim 8 was amended. Accordingly, claims 1-16 are at issue in the above-identified application.

### **I. Objection To Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the drawings. This Amendment includes amendments to the drawings that address the issues raised by the Examiner.

### **II. Objection To Specification**

The Examiner objected to the specification. This Amendment includes amendments to the specification that address the issues raised by the Examiner.

### **III. Objection To Claims**

The Examiner objected to claim 8. This Amendment amends claim 8 to correct the informality.

### **IV. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11, 13, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated U.S. Patent No. 5,977,886 ("Barile et al."). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Regarding claim 1, the passages in Barile et al. that the Examiner relies on do not teach downloading a subset of functions to a PDA. In the passages, Barile et al. teaches storing keycode sets in a user input device, having a PDA transmit a “message identifying the identified keycode set” to the user input device, and having the user input device transmit a keycode to the PDA. (Barile et al., col. 2, ll. 3-10; col. 3, ll. 2-9.) These teachings are not equivalent to the step of downloading a subset of functions to a PDA for at least the following reasons: the “user input device” of Barile et al. is not the same as a PDA; downloading a single keycode is not the same as downloading a “subset of functions”; and having a PDA transmit a “message identifying the identified keycode set” is unrelated to the step of downloading a subset of functions to a PDA at least because an identifier of a set is not the same as the set itself.

Furthermore, regarding claim 1, Barile et al. does not teach downloading a file and a subset of functions to a PDA. At least because Barile et al. does not teach each and every element of claim 1, Applicant asserts that the claims are allowable. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8 depend from claim 1 and are therefore not anticipated by Barile et al. for at least the same reasons.

Claim 9 is not anticipated by Barile et al. for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is not anticipated by Barile et al. Claims 10, 11, 13, 14, and 16 depend from claim 9 and are therefore not anticipated by Barile et al. for at least the same reasons.

**V. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,088,996 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,133,916. Applicant respectfully traverses this

rejection. Claims 4 and 12 depend from claims 1 and 9 respectively and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 7 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,088,996 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,901,246. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claims 7 and 15 depend from claims 1 and 9 respectively and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

**VI. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 7, 2004

By: *Skip Gain*  
Edward "Skip" Gain  
Registration No. 55,917

Customer Number: 26263  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
Phone: (202) 408-6358  
Fax: (312) 876-7457